

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	I	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,896		11/26/2003	George A. Olah	5431-019-999	6985
20582	7590	12/28/2004		EXAMINER	
JONES DAY				DANG, THUAN D	
51 Louisian	a Aveue, l	N.W			
WASHING	TON, DO	20001-2113	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1764	
				DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/721,896	OLAH, GEORGE A.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Thuan D. Dang	1764				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SH THE - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE!	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
2a) <u></u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 November 2003</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Applicati	on Papers						
10)[]	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
3) 🔀 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 11/26/03.	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/721,896

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pham et al (5,663,474) in view of Olah (5,073,674).

Pham discloses an alkylation process of aliphatic or aromatic hydrocarbon with olefin in the presence of solid polymeric hydrogen fluoride catalyst (the abstract; col. 2, lines 17-51; col. 4, lines 38-57).

Pham does not disclose using a polyhydrogen fluoride (see entire patent for details). However, Olah discloses that liquid onium polyhydrogen fluoride can be used as a safe alkylation catalyst (the abstract; col. 1, lines 11-68).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Pham process by using liquid onium polyhydrogen fluoride in the place of hydrogen fluoride of the Pham catalyst since it is expected that using polyhydrogen fluoride or hydrogen fluoride would yield similar results. Applicants are reminded that it has been established that closely relate homologs, analogs and isomers in chemistry may create a prima facie case of obviousness. *In re Dillon* 16 USPQ 2d 1897, 1904 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *In re Payne* 203 USPQ 245 (CCPA 1979); *In re Mills* 126 USPQ 513 (CCPA 1960); *In re Henze* 85 USPQ 261 (CCPA 1950); *In re Haas* 60 USPQ 544 (CCPA 1944).

Sulfonation of alkyl-aromatic is well-known to be used for production of detergent.

Olah discloses that the reaction is carried out in the presence of Lewis acid (col. 2, lines 58-65).

The limitation of claim 12 can be found on column 2, lines 30-33.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan D. Dang whose telephone number is 571-272-1445. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

Application/Control Number: 10/721,896 Page 4

Art Unit: 1764

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on 571-272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thuan D. Dang Primary Examiner Art Unit 1764

10721896.20041223

Jhn I